Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration with reference to the Act of 1866.

SUBJECT No. 136.

House-building advance.

Mr. K. Krishnamurti Rao, Magadi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—As the house-building advance of one year's pay to low paid Government servants is not enough to cover the cost of even the mere foundation and as borrowing to supplement the advance may deprive them of their other properties also, it is requested that Government may build houses for them and recover the cost in easy instalments.

Reply of Government.—Not feasible. The present rules are sufficiently liberal.

SUBJECT No. 137.

Mussalman co-operative inspectors.

Mr. Mahomed Abbas Khan, Central Mahomedan Association, Bangalore.

Summary of discussion.—A Mahomedan Inspector and Mahomedan Honorary Organisers may be appointed to popularize the advantages of the Co-operative system.

Reply of Government.—If a suitable Mahomedan graduate applies to the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, his appointment as a co-operative inspector will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 138.

Account texts in Kannada.

Mr. Kacharkahalli Subbanna, Bangalore taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Except the Taluk Treasury Manual, the other Account text-books are not available in Kannada. These may be translated into Kannada to enable those who do not possess sufficient knowledge of English to pass the examination in Kannada.

Reply of Government.—The Taluk Treasury Manual and the Municipal Account Manual have been translated into Kannada. The question of translating the Mysore Service Regulations and the Mysore Treasury Manual is under consideration.

EXCISE.

(*Nos. 139—142*).

SUBJECT No. 139.

Amendment of Excise Rules.

Mr. D. Srikanta Rao, Devanhalli taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The Excise Rules may be so modified as not to make the contractors liable for the faults of the vendors. The proposer added that the contractor should be held liable only for the payment of Government money, etc., and not for keeping the shop unclean or the vessels untidy and similar acts of the vendors.

Mr. Ramachar supporting the proposition said that the relation between the contractor and the vendor was similar to that between master and servant and that it was not proper to make the former criminally liable for the acts of the latter.

Mr. B. Narasinga Rao pointed out that till recently only the contractor was liable and the rules were since